

MINUTES OF THE
MARICOPA ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS
PEDESTRIAN WORKING GROUP

Friday, March 26, 1999
MAG Office Building, Suite 200 - Ocotillo Conference Room
302 North First Avenue, Phoenix

MEMBERS ATTENDING

*Michael Branham, Surprise, Chair
Bruce Meyers for Timothy Brand, Arizona
Department of Administration
Jeff Sargent, American Society of Landscape
Architects
*Mickey Ohland, Chandler
*Tami Ryall, Gilbert
Richard Janke, Glendale
*Aaron Iverson, Maricopa County

Steve Hancock, Acting Chair, Mesa
Tracy Stevens, Peoria
Richard Clewis for Lorry Kuiper, Phoenix
Planning Department
Ben Leonard for Mark Melnychenko,
Phoenix Transit
Maureen Mageau-DeCindis, RPTA
Amy MacAulay for Deborah Astin, Scottsdale
Eric Iwersen, Tempe

*Members neither present nor represented by proxy.

OTHERS PRESENT

Carl Stephani, Gila Bend
Kenny Martin, Gilbert
Dawn Coomer, MAG

Dean Brennan, Phoenix
Bob Brown, Scottsdale

1. Call to Order

Acting Chairman Steve Hancock called the meeting to order at 10:36 a.m.

2. Call to the Audience

No member of the audience wished to address the Working Group.

3. Approval of the March 12, 1999 Meeting Minutes

Eric Iwersen moved to approve the meeting minutes from March 12, 1999. Bruce Myers seconded the motion, and the motion passed unanimously.

4. Proposal and Project Selection for the Pedestrian Design Assistance Program

The Working Group began by listening to presentations from the five applicants for design assistance funds. Carl Stephani from Gila Bend provided an overview of the Central Pedestrian Way project. He showed a map of the site and explained the commercial development happening in the area. He noted

that the pedestrian project would connect several areas, including a park, school and community center. Residents now have to cross a canal, street and railroad tracks to access these destinations, and walk on dirt shoulders. The project will integrate with the future town square and historic buildings. Richard Janke asked if the requested amount of \$10,000 was sufficient for the project, and Carl explained he used his experience with past projects to derive the amount. Richard Clewis asked if funding was available to complete the project, and Carl responded that CDBG funding was being sought, but was not yet secured.

Kenny Martin from Gilbert provided an overview of the Gilbert Western Canal Trail Crossing project. He noted that Gilbert intends to connect the entire town using canals. He said the project request could be reduced to \$30,000 with the removal of the McQueen crossing. Amy MacAulay asked about the trail surface, and Kenny responded that the trails were not paved. Amy asked about signalization, and Kenny noted that there are no signals. Eric noted that the Mid-Block crossing report might provide some guidance in designing this project. Maureen Mageau-DeCindis asked why design funds were needed if the crossings would be similar to the existing crossing at Lindsay Road. Steve Hancock asked if this project would duplicate the Tempe mid-block crossing project. Kenny noted that a signalized crossing was preferred. Bruce Myers asked for counts at the Lindsay crossing, and Dawn Coomer asked about the land uses in the area. Kenny responded that counts are available and that land uses are primarily residential. Steve asked if lighting and paving were options. Kenny responded that the phase 2 project from Gilbert to Cooper includes lighting, and that there were no plans to pave the facility. Richard Clewis asked if funding was available to complete the project, and Kenny responded that there was no funding secured.

Dean Brennan provided an overview of the Laveen Watercourse/Greenbelt Pedestrian Trail in Phoenix. He showed a map of the Levine area, noting that the trail would help define and remind users of the agricultural heritage of the area. He noted the area is currently low density, and showed planned land uses for the area. The goal of the trail would be to link residents with employment and shopping. He noted that the area is experiencing lots of growth pressure and that the study was needed to show developers what was expected. In addition, the community supports the project and the goal is to be proactive in planning for non-motorized modes of travel. SRP also supports the project. The area may become an impact fee area, and developers would be expected to provide portions of the trail near their proposed developments. Amy asked about the cost estimate, and Dean responded he spoke with A Dye Design for a cost estimate. Dean noted that more than just pedestrian amenities would be considered, including water features, equestrian, access to other areas. Richard Clewis asked if the cost estimate could be reduced. Dean responded that the critical items to be addressed include right-of-way preservation and location of nodes. Standards could be development later.

Tracy Stevens provided an overview of the Peoria project located at Grand Avenue and the Burlington Northern-Santa Fe crossing. She distributed a support letter from ADOT, and noted that the project is part of a larger plan to redevelop the downtown area. She noted that the project could be reduced to \$30,000. Two pedestrian crossings would be provided. Amy asked if Grand Avenue would contain a pedestrian treatment, and Tracy was unsure. Dawn noted that an MIS is underway in the corridor, and this study may show how pedestrian elements can be integrated into the corridor.

Bob Brown from Scottsdale provided an overview of the Shea Boulevard Multi-Use Path. The path would serve an isolated community pocket and provide neighborhood access to transit, the hospital and a school. The path would connect to Maricopa County facilities and is surrounded by open space. The

path would be expensive to build because of topography. The path is on the off-street multi-use system plan, and would be on one side of Shea. He noted that the cost really couldn't be reduced due to the high cost of constructing the project.

The committee began to discuss various projects and the relative merits of each, including the ability to implement the Pedestrian Area Policies and Design Guidelines, the potential replication of the projects, whether projects focused on pedestrian issues, whether the project met an existing need, who the project would serve, linkages to other projects, community support for the projects, and cost of the projects. Eric Iwersen moved to recommend that the following projects receive funding: (1) Town of Gila Bend - \$10,000, Central Pedestrian Way; (2) City of Peoria - \$65,000, Pedestrian Crossing at Grand Avenue/Burlington Northern-Santa Fe; and (3) City of Phoenix - \$60,000, Laveen Watercourse/Greenbelt Pedestrian Trail. Eric added that since the funding request for the Gila Bend project may not be sufficient for the scope described, that any additional funds, up to \$15,000, be allocated to the Gila Bend project. Bruce Myers seconded the motion, and the committee discussed the motion. Concerns about the cost of the Gila Bend project were discussed, as well as distributing the money among more projects. The motion passed with Scottsdale and Glendale voting against the motion.

Eric Iwersen provided a summary of the consultant reviews. Dawn distributed a copy of the rankings which were divided into four categories. Bruce asked for a definition of the categories, and asked that these definitions be included in the on-call list. Richard Clewis added that the list should be dated since some firms have high turnover rates. Bruce moved to accept the on-call list, from which design assistance recipients would select consultants for MAG to contract with to provide Design Assistance, and that the categories on the list be defined. The list includes:

Most Qualified	Highly Qualified	Qualified	Not Qualified
A Dye Design	Entranco	Coe & Van Loo	Placemakers
e group	Planners Ink	Robert Bein, William Frost & Associates	
Logan Simpson Design	Urban Earth Design		

Richard Janke seconded the motion, and the motion passed unanimously.

5. Next Meeting Date

The next meeting will be held on April 9, 1999 at 10:30 a.m. The meeting will be held to begin discussing goals and objectives, and perhaps issues and opportunities, to consider in the plan. A stakeholders meeting will likely follow the meeting.

6. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 12:23 p.m.